



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/776,431	02/11/2004	Mohamed Anas Abbar	60001.0310US01/MS# 305659	2883

7590

05/15/2006

Leonard J. Hope
Merchant & Gould P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER

HUYNH, CONG LAC T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 05/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/776,431	Applicant(s) ABBAR ET AL.	
	Examiner Cong-Lac Huynh	Art Unit 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/17/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: the application filed 2/11/04, and the IDSs filed 5/17/04.
2. Claims 1-20 are pending in the case. Claims 1 and 12 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 14-20, these claims are method claims but dependent on claim 13, which is a system claim. Such dependency is not proper since it does not make sense when a system includes steps of a process.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States

Art Unit: 2178

only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-2, 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gobin et al. (US Pat No. 6,745,229, 6/1/04, filed 9/24/98).

Regarding independent claim 1, Gobin discloses:

- determining whether a request to emphasize all of the numerical data in the electronic document has been received (col 2, lines 11-41: the system enables the customer to sum up numerical figures by highlighting the numbers directly on the screen displaying the document to obtain the total or the subtotal of numerical figures shown on the displayed document; this implies that when a request for summing up made by a customer, a request for *emphasizing all of the numerical data* in the electronic document is also performed to obtain the subtotal and the total, is received)
- in response to receiving the request, locating all of the numerical data contained within the electronic document and emphasizing the located numerical data (abstract, col 2, lines 34-41, col 24, lines 12-17, col 25, lines 21-29: highlighting the numerical figures displayed in the document implies that the numerical figures are located and emphasized)

Regarding claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Gobin discloses that the electronic document comprises both text data and numerical data and the request comprises a request to emphasize only the numerical data (abstract, col 2, lines 11-41, col 24, lines

12-17: the invoice includes both text data and numerical data, and only the numerical figures are highlighted to perform the summing up as customer's request).

Claims 10 and 11 are for a computer readable medium and an apparatus of claim 1, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 12 is for a system to perform method claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 2178

9. Claims 3-7, 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gobin et al. (US Pat No. 6,745,229, 6/1/04, filed 9/24/98).

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Gobin discloses that the numerical data comprises numerals (col 2, lines 11-41: numerical figures are numerals).

Gobin does not disclose that the numerical data comprises numeral expressed as text data.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Gobin to include numerical data comprising numeral expressed as text data since it is well known to use text for a corresponding numeral when writing a check, for example. The combination of including numerical data expressed as text in conjunction with the numeral would make it easier to verify the accuracy of numerical data.

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent on claim 3, as mentioned in claimed 3, it was obvious to an ordinary skill to include text to express a numeral to Gobin. Since the language of the text is English, it is clear that the numerical data may be expressed in any of a plurality of natural languages.

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent on claim 4, as mentioned in claims 3 and 4, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Gobin to include that numeral expressed as text data may

comprises string numbers, for example, the text string for the amount on the check, which is well known feature. The inclusion of text strings for the numeral would help to verify the accuracy of numerical data.

Regarding claim 6, which is dependent on claim 5, Gobin discloses adding a highlighting attribute to the located numerical data (abstract, col 2, lines 34-41, col 24, lines 12-17, col 25, lines 23-29).

Regarding claim 7, which is dependent on claim 6, Gobin discloses that highlighting attribute comprises a color attribute (abstract, col 2, lines 34-41, col 24, lines 12-17, col 25, lines 23-29: it is clear that when data is highlighted, it has black color).

Claims 13-17 include the same subject matter as in claims 3-7, and are rejected under the same rationale.

10. Claims 8 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gobin as applied to claims 7 and 17 above, and further in view of Ryan (US Pat No. 6,154,752, filed 2/13/98).

Regarding claim 8, which is dependent on claim 7, Gobin does not disclose that a unique color attribute may be specified for each of the string numbers, the ordinal numbers, and the roman numerals.

Ryan discloses applying different colors for different hyperlink text according to the relative order in which a linking word was selected where the linking word is not limited to alpha characters, but also includes numerics and icons (col 1, line 49 to col 2, line 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Ryan to apply different colors to each of the string numbers, the ordinal numbers and the roman numerals since the ordinal numbers and the roman numerals are alpha characters, and the string numbers are numerics. Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Ryan into Gobin since utilizing a unique color for each of the string numbers, the ordinal numbers, and the roman numerals in Ryan would provide the advantage to incorporate into Gobin for enhancing the emphasis and effectively differentiating the numerical data from the normal text in a document, as well as differentiating this type of numerical data to the others.

Claim 18 includes the same subject matter as in claim 8, and is rejected under the same rationale.

11. Claims 9, 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gobin as applied to claims 8 and 18 above, and further in view of Curreri et al. (US Pat No. 6,091,896, filed 12/22/95)

Regarding claim 9, which is dependent on claim 8, Gobin does not disclose:

Art Unit: 2178

- receiving a request to deemphasize the located numerical data
- in response to receiving the request, removing the emphasis from the located numerical data

Curreri allows the debugger to highlight source statements for which the data change point instruction has executed, disables such highlighting, and removes the highlighting of the currently highlighted source statements by processing the corresponding commands (col 10, lines 35-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Curreri to apply said highlighting, and removing the emphasis, which is removing the highlighting, on the numerical data since the alphanumeric characters of the source statements include both numerals and characters. Also, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Curreri into Gobin since removing the data highlighting in Curreri would provide a tool for easily changing the emphasis of different data on a document.

Claims 19-20 include the same subject matter as in claim 9, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Bukszar et al. (US Pat No. 6,133,916, filed 4/8/98).

Lim et al. (US Pat No. 5,418,718, 5/23/95).


Freivald et al. (US Pat No. 5,983,268, 11/9/99).

Davis (US Pat App Pub No. 2005/0086216, priority 2/17/00).

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cong-Lac Huynh whose telephone number is 571-272-4125. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Cong-Lac Huynh
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2178
05/11/06